

Illinois U Library

MARCH 28, 1946

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

BRIEN McMAHON

EDWIN JOHNSON

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

THOMAS F. FARRELL

(See also page 16)

COMING

April 4, 1946

Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 11, NUMBER 48



\$4.50 A YEAR : 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 28:

"Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?"

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Mr. DENNY | 4 |
| Senator McMAHON | 5 |
| General FARRELL | 7 |
| Mrs. DOUGLAS | 9 |
| Senator JOHNSON | 11 |
| THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN | 16 |
| QUESTIONS, PLEASE! | 17 |



THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 4:

"Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?"



The Broadcast of March 28, 1946, originated in Town Hall, in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MARCH 28, 1946

VOL. 11, No. 48

Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?

Announcer:

America's Town Meeting is on the air from Town Hall in New York City, just off Times Square. Last week we told you about the awards your Town Meeting had received through the magazine *Billboard*, from the radio editors of the Nation, and the George Foster Peabody award for the best radio program in its field.

Tonight we are very happy to receive a different kind of award. This time from a national organization of school children known as Youth Builders which conducts forum and discussion groups in our public schools. In a poll conducted among several thousand of these school children, your Town Meeting was singled out as the radio program that has done most to light the way to peace.

Here on the platform with us is the committee elected by the school children to make this award to Mr. Denny, the president of

Town Hall and founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting. There are three girls and one boy. So let's start with the boy, Russell Robinson, 13 years old, of the Youth Builders Club in Junior High School 3, Manhattan. Russell.

Russell Robinson: I think that America's Town Meeting of the Air gives the average radio listener a chance to hear leading authorities discuss all sides of up-to-the-minute problems. This helps the people get the real facts so they can discuss their opinions with their friends intelligently and so they can help the Government solve problems the way the people think they should be solved. That's why I voted for America's Town Meeting of the Air as America's best peace-building radio program. (*Applause.*)

Announcer: Thank you, Russell. Next here is Tanya Lisson, 13

years old of Straus Junior High School in Brooklyn. Tanya.

Tanya Lisson: I voted for America's Town Meeting of the Air because I think that it's the perfect example of freedom of speech and freedom of speech is one of the freedoms for which we fought. It promotes good will and understanding among all peoples and only in this way can we have peace in the world. (*Applause.*)

Announcer: Thank you, Tanya. Now, Ruthenia Finely, 13 years old, of Junior High School 136, Manhattan. Ruthenia.

Ruthenia Finely: We think America's Town Meeting of the Air is the new and best way of understanding through radio what is happening right now. It's really the finest way of learning modern history. Not only adults need to know current history but children do, too, because this helps to make intelligent citizens who will know how to build the peace. (*Applause.*)

Announcer: Thank you, Ruthenia. Finally a word from the chairman of this committee, Rosann Sakrides, 12 years old, of the Youth Builders Club, P. S. 34, the Bronx. Rosann.

Rosann Sakrides: In the name of the Youth Builders of the city of New York, I would like to present to you, Mr. Denny, and to America's Town Meeting of the Air, this award for being the best peace-building radio program as

voted by the Youth Builders Club members. We appreciate what you are doing, Mr. Denny. We, too, are trying to help promote peace in the schools and communities. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny: Thank you, Rosann, Ruthenia, Tanya, and Russell. Your words will be an inspiration to every one of us who has a hand in building and conducting these programs. If we can get enough of you young people to think objectively and honestly about these great problems before us, maybe 20 years from now the world won't be in the mess it's in today.

In a moment we're going to ask two United States Senators, a member of Congress, and one of the men who helped to develop the atomic bomb, who was formerly associated with the Manhattan Project, to tell us how we should deal with this most powerful force yet discovered by man.

This is our fourth Town Meeting on this subject since the first atomic bomb was dropped last August on Hiroshima, and tonight we're going to the heart of the present dispute over the question "Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?"

There's a long background to this question and there are several bills before Congress dealing with the control of atomic energy. Congressman May and Senator Johnson introduced one of the first of

these bills last fall known as the May-Johnson Bill which brought a storm of protest from the scientists, many of whom had worked on the development of the atomic bomb in what was known as the Manhattan Project.

Meanwhile, the Senate appointed an Atomic Energy Committee, headed by Senator McMahon of Connecticut and including Senator Johnson, both of whom are with us here tonight. For a time it looked as if the McMahon Bill would be satisfactory to the scientists and those who favored civilian control, while the May-Johnson Bill was initially preferred by the military. However, a little earlier this month, on March 12 to be exact, Senator Vandenberg proposed an amendment to the McMahon Bill which was passed over the protest of Senator McMahon by a six to one vote of his committee.

This amendment has stirred up the scientists again, who feel that it gives control to the military through a sort of veto power. So the controversy goes on at white heat.

Senator McMahon, I hope you will tell us just what this Vandenberg amendment means and how you think we should control the production and use of atomic energy. Senator Brien McMahon of Connecticut. (*Applause.*)

Senator McMahon:

A friend of mine said the other day, after I was defeated ten to

one on the Vandenberg amendment, that I must now know what it felt like to be atomized. I assured him it was but a temporary exhibition of fission which I felt sure would be healed and stopped when the Senate voted.

From all over this country, a demand is arising to put atomic energy under civilian control. I believe that there is an instinctive realization in the hearts of men that this new force may contain within itself the ability to change our economy, our standard of living, our very lives.

Our people realize that this force can be channeled for peace or war. Our people realize that the military of necessity thinks of war and the progress for peace would be subordinated by the military, consciously or subconsciously.

Our people also realize that while we cannot and must not deny military participation in atomic energy until international controls are assured, we must, if we hope to be successful in putting a decent, workable, international control plan into effect, indicate concretely how we, who alone have this force, intend that it be used.

Now Senator Johnson says he is for control by civilians, too. Everybody is, to hear them talk, but "look not at what they say. Look ye at what they do."

Let's look at the Vandenberg amendment. The amendment sets up a military board to review and

to censor every single action of the commission. They can question every act and every decision. They can peer into every memorandum, investigate every conference, every employee, and every single action which the commission takes, proposes to take, or fails to take. They do all the foregoing to test whether that which is proposed by the commission will affect national defense.

The proponents of this quaint proposal assure us that, although these are the powers given, they will not be exercised by the board, and, if they are exercised to the full, then the President will rebuke them and remove them and appoint a new board, for, you see, the President will be the referee of this strange and unworkable administrative monstrosity. He will have to have his own board to advise him on what decisions to make.

I say you couldn't run a small chain of fruit stores with this set-up, to say nothing of a two and one-half million dollar manufacturing enterprise, the most complicated and intricate on the face of the earth.

The Vandenberg amendment provides an administrative cockpit where the civilian and military will fight it out day by day to control policy. We'll end up with no effective control of the most vital physical force of our times, because we will have a stalemate.

Now let us examine why this impossible proposition was adopted by a vote of ten to one. The men who outvoted me — and now isn't that an understatement — are patriotic Americans who are as interested in their country's welfare and defense as I am or you are. They did this because of the mistaken notion that they were protecting our security by injecting the military into every phase of the situation. Instead, they are truly prejudicing our security.

You see, there are two meanings to the word "security." When you fasten the windows just so, when you place scientists in rooms and forbid them to talk to their brother scientists about their common problems, when you spend all your time watching your secrets, you practice a kind of security. This might be termed "security by concealment."

It is dangerous to rely on this kind of security because every day your secrets are seeping away, if not by espionage, then certainly and more likely by the inventiveness and creativeness of the scientists and engineers of other nations. This is the kind of security the military understands and practices, as every veteran knows. I assure you that if this country relies on this kind of security, we will be erecting a poor imitation of a Maginot Line.

But real security is what I call

"security by achievement"—that is, the keeping ahead by giving birth to new inventions, new and better secrets, improved and cheaper methods. This kind of security in the absence of international control, is the slim last hope to avoid destruction. This kind of security cannot come except from the scientists and inventors who made the bomb, and who won't and can't work on a basis of waking on reveille and retiring on taps.

What's the proper solution? In my opinion, we could appoint a seven-man board—four civilians and the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy. If problems came up affecting national defense, it would be fair to assume that these civilians would be advised by experts in their respective departments.

If perchance the commission voted to override the Secretary of State, or War, or the Navy, or the chairman of the commission, then an appeal could be taken to the President who could settle it as Commander-in-Chief.

This proposal seems to me to make sense, and I shall urge it on the floor of the Senate when the bill is considered. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator McMahon. Now, let's hear from one of the military men to which Senator McMahon referred, an associate of General Groves in the Manhattan Project which developed atomic energy, and who is now chief en-

gineer of the State of New York, Department of Public Works, Major General T. F. Farrell. General Farrell. (*Applause.*)

General Farrell:

Our Army and Navy should not be denied effective participation in the control of atomic energy for military purposes. They have the primary duty of planning and providing for national defense. They should be given the best tools for the job.

Atomic weapons, with their vastly increased powers of destruction, dwarf all others in the Nation's arsenal and form the great core around which other weapons will be used in support.

Our military services should have direct, ready, and continuing access to the uses of atomic energy for military purposes. Under Senator McMahon's bill, they would be forced to stand, hat-in-hand, outside a stranger's door and say, "Please, sirs, may we have weapons to get ready to defend our country?"

The *New York Times* recently asked editorially, "Why should the Army and Navy be treated as intruders?" In case of war, the Army and Navy will have to use those weapons and, perhaps, beat off an enemy using them against us. Is it unreasonable or just good sense that they should have a voice and not a small voice in how the weapons are made, how they shall be used, and what information we broad-

cast about them to potential enemies?

The military interest extends to research and development of military uses, the design, manufacture, storage, and use of weapons, and security measures relating to military uses.

That interest should be set up by Congress as a matter of right and duty, rather than one of privilege to be accorded or denied by another agency.

I wish that Senator McMahon and Mrs. Douglas could agree with me that the limited authority requested is participation by the military, not domination.

Whether the other side agree or not, right now the bomb is the thing. If the materials are being made for peaceful use of atomic energy, atomic weapons are just around the corner.

It would be futile to outlaw those weapons unless we can also outlaw war, itself. If war comes, so will the weapons, and it will be a life and death race between the warring nations to get them first and thus win the war.

Let us, therefore, temper our idealism with realism. We are beguiling ourselves with wishful thinking, if we look for great peacetime benefits to flow from atomic energy unless and until the world finds a way to stop wars. When that is done the great door of the atomic treasure room—now barely cracked—can be flung wide

open and we can help ourselves to new and wonderful riches. Until that happy day we should not deny contact with our best weapons to those we charge with our defense. To do so could cripple us in our hour of need.

Your Army and Navy are servants of the Government. Their leaders have shown deep and abiding concern for our national welfare. An American does not change his loyalties by putting on a uniform. Those leaders want peace. No one hates war more than he who has lived with its horrors.

I agree wholeheartedly that the commission to control atomic energy should be predominantly civilian. So do the War and Navy Departments. I am sure Senator Johnson agrees, also. I insist, however, that the military services should have plenary representation on matters relating to national defense and security.

They should be allowed to speak on those matters in the council chambers of the commission. We don't want them to review and censor every action of the commission to which Senator McMahon properly objects—just talk across the table.

While I much prefer the more direct and effective plan of minority representation on the commission, Senator Vandenberg's proposal for a military liaison board does provide a means for the serv-

ices to express their views. While the plan is somewhat cumbersome, it provides the necessary safeguards and I believe it can work.

Senator McMahon's new proposal tonight for a board of four civilians and the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, is a recognition of the right of the services to be represented adequately, in the first instance, on matters of prime concern to them. I welcome this recognition.

I have no fear of our country being delivered into the hands of military fascism. A glance at our present headlong demobilization of the mightiest force in history should dispel any such fear. I have far greater fear of our country being rendered militarily impotent if we now hamstring your Army and Navy in the use of this great new force of atomic energy.

Give them their due. "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, General Farrell. Now we hear from a charming lady who was once a star of the American stage, who moved to California a number of years ago, became active in politics, and was elected to Congress last year. Last month she introduced the McMahon Bill in the House so it really should be known as the McMahon-Douglas Bill. Congressman Helen Gahagan Douglas of California. (*Applause.*)

Mrs. Douglas:

General Farrell says he has no fear of our country being delivered into the hands of military fascism and cites the headlong demobilization of our armed forces as an example to dispel such fear. With all due respect to General Farrell, our armed forces were demobilized not because of the military, but because of a civilian Commander-in-Chief, a civilian Secretary of War, a civilian Secretary of the Navy, and a civilian Congress. (*Applause.*)

General Farrell quotes from the Bible, "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Let us also beware of the warning of Cicero and the acts of Caesar. Caesar crossed the Rubicon and brought with him his armies into Rome. To do so was illegal. As the result of Caesar's act, democracy in Rome was overthrown and never rose again.

The atomic bomb is here to stay. The question is, are we?

All the world has been shocked by the release of atomic energy. Why not? A force so great that 500 atomic bombs could in one night wipe out every industrial city in America—no wonder we're frightened a little.

But we mustn't lose our heads and forget the things we know. The most important of all—civilian control, the cornerstone of our form of government. We mustn't let fear rob us, shut us off from

a whole new life. We mustn't let fear create conditions which will make war inevitable.

Thank goodness, the great cross section of American people aren't losing their heads. My office is filled with their demands for definite civilian controls of atomic energy. They want no part of our American life dominated by the military. But even for those who put their trust in a stock pile of bombs as against a council table, even for those who regard atomic energy primarily as a weapon, military control does not offer the protection they seek.

It was the scientists who discovered the source of the sun's energy, and who developed the atomic bomb. It is the scientist who will discover and develop the basic principles from which the blessings of the future or any new weapons will come. And the ablest of our scientists will not work because they cannot work under military control.

The men who must study war are not the best men to plan for peace. They are not even the best men to invent new weapons of war. The military was deaf to the warnings of the scientists who in 1939 came to them with stories of a new kind of bomb, a million times as powerful as TNT. The military expressed an interest and asked to be kept informed, but the scientists who today are called impractical visionaries weren't dis-

couraged. The urgency was too great. They had scientific facts the military must be made to understand. The scientists went on with their laboratory work, on with their conferences. They carried their story to the Administration underlining the urgency of development of atomic energy and warned what would happen if the enemy were to develop an atomic bomb first.

These impractical scientists, in the meantime, made and kept their own rules of secrecy and kept them so well that the Germans never even learned that we had an atomic project.

In 1942, when the scientists had proved their theories and were ready to go into full-scale production, the Army was asked to take charge of the project. Why? Was it because only the Army could keep the work secret? Was it because the Army had better engineers than our industrial companies? No, the atomic project was turned over the Army because the Army was the only government agency that could spend two billion dollars on secret work without having to render a public account. Are we then to have the military dominate the future of atomic energy and our lives, because of a wartime experiment? If we are wise, we won't do that, General Farrell.

I have introduced the McMahon Bill in the House of Representatives. The bill recognizes that basic,

scientific research and development in the sciences must be free of secrecy restrictions in order to survive.

The bill recognizes that research and development is one thing and the necessarily secret work of applying fundamental knowledge in military technology with the advice of the Army and Navy is quite another. This discrimination is a difficult, but entirely possible task and a nationally vital one.

I am unalterably opposed to the Vandenberg amendment for if passed, as Senator McMahon says, it will mean that we will have military instead of civilian control of atomic energy, and military control will mean that we have crippled ourselves for whatever lies ahead, peace or war. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mrs. Douglas. I expect Senator Johnson is going to accuse Senator McMahon of being unfair by having such a charming, as well as capable proponent of his views. (*Laughter.*)

Senator Johnson, we're delighted, indeed, to welcome you back to Town Hall as a member this time of the Atomic Energy Committee and co-author of another bill dealing with this question which amply qualifies you to speak on this subject, whichever side you take. Senator Edwin Johnson of Colorado. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Senator McMahon has cautioned you not to listen to my words. (*Laughter.*) Well, I hope you do not follow his advice. I feel deeply about atomic energy and I want you to listen to me. I want you to listen to me with your ears and I want you to listen to me with your reason.

In answer to the question, "Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?" the answer, of course, is, atomic energy belongs to the people and its control is their job. This being a Republic, Congress acts for them. Congress, in turn, for obvious reasons, must delegate to the creatures of Congress the right to produce atomic energy under proper safeguards and to use it.

Please bear in mind that the Constitution has imposed upon Congress the responsibility for the common defense and security of this Republic, and that responsibility is paramount to all others.

If you don't believe me, go to Germany. Go to Japan. Find out about the security of a nation and whether or not it is paramount.

Consequently, for many months now, a special committee of the Senate has been hard at work perfecting legislation to control this new and very dangerous power. Very fortunately, the world has the UNO, mankind's one great and good hope for permanent peace.

Very fortunately, too, the UNO is studying international controls of atomic energy.

The Senate Committee has almost finished its Herculean task and soon will report a bill. Because of its extremely dangerous character, and I want to emphasize over and over again that word "dangerous," there is unanimous agreement in the committee that atomic energy and its production be made an air-tight government monopoly.

It is also the purpose of this committee to free atomic science and atomic technological development from all unnecessary regimentation but, at the same time, through some such unique innovation as the Vandenberg amendment, safeguard the common defense and security of this Republic.

Some borderline decisions have had to be made. Mrs. Douglas, to the contrary notwithstanding, it is extremely difficult to separate the domestic from the foreign phases of atomic energy and to draw a clear line between its theoretical constructive application and its demonstrated destructive use.

Also, it has been hard to make a distinction on any rational basis between the atomic bomb and other super-lethal weapons. In the last year of the war, we dropped a million tons of TNT on Germany and three million tons of incendiary and TNT bombs on

Japan. Three million tons! Think of it!

It can make little difference to a dead Japanese civilian whether he was seared to death with an orthodox incendiary or a modern atomic bomb.

The threat of world war does not come from jungle tribes. It comes from the most advanced, the most enlightened peoples of the earth. The more advanced, the graver the danger.

War has been and is the foremost pursuit of civilized man. It requires more treasure and expense, more effort and time than any other function of organized society. America is a peace-loving Nation, devoted to culture, but war costs us far more than education.

Under the demands of war for more and more destructive weapons, science has made spectacular strides. The discovery of atomic energy sprang from the loins of a cruel and inhuman war. The atomic bomb is the cheapest and the most effective weapon ever devised by man. It rates high as a killer. It outranks all other weapons as a destroyer. Lightning and the tornado are dwarfed into insignificance by it. The brightest sunshine is like a shadow when compared to its brilliant flash.

If there should be another World War, it will be used either to start that war or to end it, and I lay down that challenge to my

opponents tonight. I beg them not to be wishful thinkers. The only way the world can escape from its frightfulness is not to have another World War. As General Farrell has just said, it can be outlawed only by outlawing war itself.

To be sure, we can tear down our atomic bomb factories and destroy our supply of source material and tell everyone our precious military secrets. We can follow Mrs. Douglas and forget war. But I must say to her that war may not forget us. We can bury our heads in the sand and we can risk having our Nation ravaged and our people enslaved, but the prudent Americans do not try to escape the realities of life that way.

The only defense against an atomic bomb is an atomic bomb. True, that kind of a defense might result in an armament race but we must assume that risk until war itself is no longer a threat. The only cure for an armament race is an international resolve against it. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Johnson. Now before we take the discussion around the microphone and the questions from this interested Town Hall audience, we're going to pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer:

You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air from

Town Hall in New York City, where we are carrying on a discussion of the question "Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?" We have heard from Senators Brien McMahon and Edwin Johnson, Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas, and Major General T. F. Farrell. They will take questions from the audience in a few minutes. For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period to follow, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing and be sure to include your zone number and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

Mr. Denny: I think you might feel a little better, ladies and gentlemen, if you would come up here around the microphone for a few minutes and see if we can clear up some of these apparent inconsistencies. Senator McMahon, we haven't heard from you for a time.

Senator McMahon: I would like, Mr. Denny, to comment on Senator Johnson's straw man that he put up at the end of his remark saying that we couldn't tear down our atomic bomb factories. Of course, we can't tear them down and I think it's foolish to advocate any such thing. No one who is responsible and is advocating the passage of the bill, which I have

introduced, is, to my knowledge, advocating that.

Senator Johnson: Which bill do you mean, Brien? Brien has introduced six bills. Every few days he introduces a bill, and tonight we learn that he has another bill on the way. Which one are you talking about?

Senator McMahon: I'll tell you the one I'm talking about, Ed. It's the one we've been working on and working over for the past three or four weeks. It isn't the May-Johnson Bill which you ducked out of and then took another bill and introduced it a few weeks ago. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: That isn't fair, Brien, to say that I ducked out of the May-Johnson Bill. Brien knows exactly what happened. There wasn't a comma, there wasn't a letter in that bill that I wrote. I was acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and Brien knows that the chairmen of committees introduce bills for the departments which they represent. He knows that I made it clear on the Senate floor and I made it clear before the committee and I made it clear everywhere.

Senator McMahon: You know that I didn't introduce six bills. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Senator Johnson: Here's all six of them. Here they are. If I can count—one, two, three, four, five, six.

Senator McMahon: Senator Johnson knows that those are what are known as committee revisions of the bill, a common ordinary practice in committee of going over the bill and changing this line and changing that line, because that's how you get good legislation. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: We're learning something about what makes our printing bill so big down there. Congressman Douglas.

Mrs. Douglas: I wish I could get a word in edgewise here. I want to agree with General Farrell and Senator Johnson that if we have another war, atomic bombs will be used. I also want to correct Senator Johnson and say that I have not forgotten war. I have war very much on my mind. I visit the hospitals once a week.

But I also want to answer his last statement when he said, "The only answer to war is to resolve against it." I ask the simple question, when do we begin? (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: Mrs. Douglas, I didn't say the answer to war was to resolve against it. I said the answer to an armament race was to resolve against an armament race.

Mrs. Douglas: Well, it's the same thing. If you have an armament race, you will have war. So when do we resolve against an armament race? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Would you like to pitch in here, General Farrell?

General Farrell: I would like to comment on Mrs. Douglas' statement that the scientists kept the secret and thus prevented Germany from learning to make the atomic bomb. I'd like to say, also, that so did tens of thousands of others, army and navy officers and men, industrial engineers, workers, the press and the radio, all under a comprehensive security plan administered by the Army under a presidential directive. The self-censorship of the scientists by itself would have been completely ineffective in keeping the secret of the bomb. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: May I say a word about that?

Mr. Denny: Yes, go ahead.

Senator Johnson: The scientists didn't keep the secret from Germany. The scientists got the secret from Germany. That's where the atomic bomb secrets came from.

Mr. Denny: Mrs. Douglas?

Mrs. Douglas: Senator Johnson is perfectly right. We got many secrets from overseas and if we had not allowed, for instance, Dr. Bohr, to come into this country, we wouldn't have realized what was happening over there. But the scientists did keep the secret. They found the secret. They discussed it at Princeton when Doctor Bohr came over here. They took it to the Navy. The Navy was

not very interested, asked them to come back and given them a further report. Then they took it to the President of the United States and then they set up a security system of their own where they did not publish the reports of the work they were doing in the scientific magazines.

Senator Johnson: Didn't Bohr get his secret from Otto Hahn?

Mrs. Douglas: Strassman.

Senator Johnson: That's right —Germans.

Mr. Denny: All right, well we seem to have learned that the secret came out of Germany to a large extent. That right?

Mrs. Douglas: That's right. Then a man by the name of Fermi helped, who was an Italian by birth, and a man by the name of Szilard, who was a Hungarian by birth, and a man by the name of Joliot, who was a Frenchman by birth, and a man by the name of Chadwick, who was an Englishman by birth. Finally, when you begin to study these names and study the Smyth report* very carefully, you realize that the scientific data that led up to the making of the atomic bomb was gathered from many parts of the world. (*Applause.*)

Senator McMahon: I suppose you knew, Mrs. Douglas, that of the names that were mentioned in

*Atomic Energy for Military Purposes, by Henry D. Smyth, Princeton, N.J. The Princeton University Press. 254 pages. \$1.25, paper; \$2, cloth.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

BRIEN McMAHON—Senator McMahon, a Democrat from Connecticut, is chairman of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. Born in Norwalk, Connecticut, in 1903, he has an A.B. degree from Fordham University and an LL.B. from Yale. From 1927 until 1933, he practiced law in Norwalk. He then became judge of the City Court of Norwalk. From 1933 to 1935 he was also special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General. He was acting assistant during 1935-36, and became assistant attorney general in charge of the Criminal Division in 1936. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1944.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON—Senator Johnson, Democrat, was elected to the United States Senate in 1936. He was graduated from Lincoln, Nebraska, High School in 1903. After becoming a railroad laborer in 1901, he was successfully telegrapher, train dispatcher, homesteader, and manager of a farmers' cooperative association. Senator Johnson was a member of the Colorado Legislature for four terms, 1923-1931; Lieutenant Governor of Colorado, 1931-1933; and Governor of the State for two terms, 1933-1937. He is a member of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS — Mrs. Douglas, who is Democratic Representative in Congress from California is a former stage star and opera singer and is also the wife of Melvyn Douglas, a motion picture star. Mrs. Douglas was born in Boonton, New Jersey. She was educated at Berkeley School for Girls, Brooklyn, New York; Capen School for Girls, Northampton, Massachusetts; and at Barnard College of Columbia University.

From 1940 to 1944, Mrs. Douglas was Democratic National Committeewoman for

California. She was also during that period vice chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, and chairman of the Women's Division. She has served on the National Advisory Committee of the WPA, and on the State Committee of NYA. She has been a member of the Board of Governors of the California Housing and Planning Association, and a Presidential appointee of the Voluntary Participation Committee of the Office of Civilian Defense. In 1944, she was elected to the U.S. Congress where she is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

THOMAS FRANCIS FARRELL—Major General Farrell, chief engineer of the State of New York, in the Department of Public Works, has recently been associated with the Manhattan Project for the development of the atom bomb. A native of Brunswick, New York, he is a graduate of La Salle Institute and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, at Troy, N.Y., and of the Engineer School of the U.S. Army at Ft. Humphreys, Virginia.

From 1913 to 1917, General Farrell was engaged in engineering work on the Panama Canal. From 1921 to 1924, he was an instructor at the Engineers School at Ft. Humphreys, and from 1924 to 1926 was an instructor in engineering at the U.S. Military Academy.

After four years as commissioner of canals and waterways, in charge of the operation and maintenance of the canal system of the State of New York, he was made chief engineer of the New York State Department of Public Works.

During World War I, Major General Farrell was promoted through the grades to major, serving two years overseas. In February, 1941, he returned to active army duty with the rank of colonel.

the Smyth Report as having been responsible for this great discovery that only a very, very few of them are left, because they could not continue to work under the Army restrictions that they were placed under.

Mr. Denny: General Farrell, have you any comment to make before we take the questions from the audience?

General Farrell: Yes, I happen to know that the project has recently—or not too recently—undertaken some new extensive research and development work on entirely new phases of atomic energy, so while it is true that a certain number of the scientists have gone back to their educational pursuits, there are still a large number engaged in the fur-

ther development of this great new source of energy.

Mrs. Douglas: Not the names that were in the Smyth Report. You will not find them working now underneath the Army. But I'd like to quote from Dr. Irving Langmuir, Nobel Prize Winner and Associate Director of the General Electric Company, on this subject. He said, "Any such secrecy as we had during the war under military control would stop nearly all progress in those atomic sciences."

Mr. Denny: Senator Johnson?

Senator Johnson: Mr. Denny, I simply want to say that, on behalf of the patriotic scientists of Amer-

ica, I resent the statement that they are indulging in a sit-down strike because they simply don't like some little thing about the Army. That is not true.

Mrs. Douglas: Of course, it's not true. I agree with you, Senator Johnson. They are not indulging in a sit-down strike, but they cannot work underneath the kind of army regulations, and here I have a sheaf of quotes from the testimony that's been given in Washington saying they cannot work under the decompartmentalized system of the Army—not that they *will* not—they *cannot*. They are not going to sit there just to make people feel something's happening! (*Applause.*)

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now let's take these questions from this packed Town Hall audience here. Remember that Town Hall is offering a \$25 United States Savings Bond for the question that's considered best in the opinion of our committee of judges for the purpose of bringing out facts and clarifying this discussion—and that's something we need to do—provided those questions are limited to 25 words.

We have selected a number of questions from among several hundred sent in by our radio audience, and we are paying \$5 for each of these questions used.

If you have a question, will you please raise your hand and let me see the name of the person to whom your question is directed.

The gentleman right down here on the second row. Yes?

Man: Question for General Farrell. Would it be possible, General, to have the atomic energy under civilian control, but the bomb under the armed forces since it's for national defense? Could that be done?

General Farrell: Essentially, I think that's what the military is asking, except that the two activities be combined for orderly ad-

ministration. The military asks for participation so far as military use of the energy is concerned. They don't ask for full control.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the second row balcony.

Man: Congressman Douglas. How would the utilization of atomic energy by strong industrial nations effect our national economy if atomic energy is controlled by the military here?

Mrs. Douglas: Well, the scientists tell us, and of course, I may be rather naive in this whole subject, but it seems to me that the only people who really know about nuclear physics are the scientists. They tell us that if in peacetime we have the same restriction that we had in wartime—remember that the basic science was discovered before the Army took over, the whole program was laid out, they knew by calculations that they could have an atomic bomb—then the Army came in and did a good job. There were certain hindrances—and again I've got a whole sheaf of them here—that took place under military control.

Now, because it was war, they went through, and as one scientist, Dr. Langmuir, says, they violated certain restrictions in order to get their work done, and there are instances of delays of 18 months, 6 months, because of this decom-

partmentalized system that the Army had.

Now if you have that in peacetime, you simply can't go ahead in basic fundamental science. It means that if other countries had the freedom to go ahead, we'd be left behind, and if we were in an armaments race, we might be very greatly left behind.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman there.

Man: Senator Johnson. You said that the only way to fight an atomic bomb is with another bomb. What difference would it make to an American killed with atomic bombs that other ones were dropped on our supposed enemy?

Senator Johnson: It wouldn't make very much difference, my friend. Very little.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Yes, Senator McMahon?

Senator McMahon: I'd like to supplement Senator Johnson's answer. Having bombs of our own may give us the satisfaction of knowing that if some other nation wipes out our cities, we can wipe out theirs. But this is a grim sort of satisfaction indeed. It is not security. Security depends not on whether we make atomic bombs, but primarily on whether other nations make atomic bombs. The only way we can really know what other nations are doing in this line of business is through some effective means of international control. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: I agree completely with Senator McMahon on that point, except this: while it is very poor security, it's the only security that we have.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator McMahon, here's a question for you from Wheat Ridge, Colorado. "Atomic energy is still a war weapon. It isn't ready yet for industrial use. Therefore, wouldn't it be more logical to have it under military control?"

Senator McMahon: I think the lady is mistaken in her assumption. Atomic energy is not necessarily a war weapon. Atomic bombs are war weapons. As far as atomic energy being ready for industrial use, we have had the testimony of Dr. Gustafson, among other scientists, vice president of the University of Chicago, an eminent physicist, that today, today with very little more effort, widespread industrial use can be made of atomic energy. We also have the satisfaction of knowing that right today it has great medical and biological uses. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator, while you're on that subject, are you in position to say any of the things that atomic energy can be definitely used for in the immediate future?

Senator McMahon: Yes, I believe it is in the immediate future that we'll see steam boilers run by atomic energy. That has been the contention of many of the men who were foremost in the field.

Right today, we have high hopes, indeed, that it can be put to good use as a treatment of cancer. (*Applause.*) In fact, the testimony of the eminent Colonel Warren was, as I recollect it, before the committee, that it had a most hopeful future in that field. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Johnson, have you a comment to add?

Senator Johnson: Yes, just a word on the medical side of it. The gamma ray is what is used in the medical science and, of course, that can be induced in other metals than uranium and it can be used entirely without any dangers from making bombs. That is, if you induce the gamma ray into another metal, you can go ahead and use it for medical purpose and there's no danger of bombs. Of course, that's certainly all right.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle.

Man: General Farrell. Should the military control atomic energy, what check do we have to prevent the military forces from becoming a dangerously supreme authority in America? (*Applause.*)

General Farrell: The military do not acquire any new power by participating in the control of atomic energy for military purposes. A civilian can become a dictator as well as the military. As I recall it, Hitler was a civilian. So I don't feel in our form of government that giving the military control

over the things with which they're primarily concerned increases our liability of getting a dictator. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. You're not satisfied, sir?

Man: The General says there is the possibility of a dictatorship, whether it be a civilian or military force. That danger we have to guard against in America.

General Farrell: Agreed.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. All right. The gentleman on the third row here.

Man: Senator McMahon. Does not the dual use of atomic energy for peace and war warrant its use by the military in order to preserve its civilian use?

Senator McMahon: I will say to the gentleman that its military use can be done away with by international control. I further say to this gentleman that if we are unsuccessful in getting military control that we can only assure more, better, bigger—if you want to use that terminology to apply to these terrible lethal instruments of death—we can only get the supply to the military through the people who invented it, the scientists, the engineers, and the industrialists who produced it, and the Army did none of those. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Congressman Douglas, here's a question from an ex-sergeant, of Chicago. "If the Government will license universities, private cor-

porations, technical institutes, and research foundations to use atomic energy, what have we to fear from military control?"

Mrs. Douglas: Well, that's what we've been discussing tonight. The point is that even if you license industries, universities—if you shut the door, as one of the scientists said—you lock more out than you lock in. They think scientific work cannot go on underneath military supervision. We have a great deal to fear in that if we set up atomic energy underneath a military control, we announce to the world that we've started on an atomic armament race. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man.

Young Man: My question is for Senator Johnson. If the Army keeps the secret of the atomic bomb, it would seem as if we were using it for war. But we don't want to use it for war. We want to use it for peacetime uses.

Mr. Denny: You're almost as bad as an adult. You've gone over twenty-five words. (*Laughter.*)

Senator Johnson: Well, young man, I very completely agree with every word that you've said. Of course, we don't want to use it for military purposes. But, we must have military security first. First things come first, and after we have military security, then we can reap the rich field of constructive uses out of this powerful energy, this new energy. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady here. Yes.

Lady: For Senator Johnson.

Mr. Denny: Well, now, wait a minute. You held up a number three card and that's for Mr. Farrell.

Lady: I made a mistake. I'm sorry.

Mr. Denny: Number two. Well, that's for Mrs. Douglas. Yes.

Lady: Mrs. Douglas. If the use of the bomb were outlawed, internationally, like poisoned gas, what would be left is civilian use. Therefore, shouldn't civilians control it?

Mr. Denny: That's an argumentative question. We get the point.

Mrs. Douglas: Well, I think that's an "if" question. We haven't yet outlawed it internationally, and we're all agreed on that and what we're trying to do through the United Nations is to set up such conditions that people won't want to go to war. That's what we've got to work on. We've got to work on the science of human relations and you don't work on it by starting out setting up an atomic armament factory over here. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Senator Johnson. Here's a question for you from North Judson, Indiana. "If the Army becomes the guardian of our atomic power, won't this postpone indefinitely the use of atomic developments for peacetime living?"

Senator Johnson: Well, first things come first. We must have

security in this country before we can experiment and play around with anything as dangerous as atomic energy. After we get our military security through international agreements, or however they may come—and the UNO is working hard on the program—when ever they are worked out, then God bless us, we want to get all the constructive good we can out of atomic energy. It belongs to the people and the people should have its benefits. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mrs. Douglas?

Mrs. Douglas: We all agree that we want security. But you don't arrive at security whether it's for war or peace by setting up the kind of conditions under which scientists cannot work. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady.

Lady: General Farrell. Why do you feel the scientists will be loath to share their secrets if the need should arise? This was not the case in the development of radar which the Army had previously turned down.

General Farrell: I don't believe I quite understand the question of the scientists being loath to share the secret.

Mr. Denny: What she really means is do you think the scientists will be loath to share their secret as they did in the case of radar which the Army first turned down.

General Farrell: I think not. I

MAY 2 1947

think they would be very happy to share the secret. The only question is that of security which always comes first.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now while General Farrell and Senator McMahon prepare their summaries for this evening's discussion, we have an announcement for you about next week's program.

Announcer: The next big question before us is what to do about extending the draft which expires on May 15. Our armed forces are being demobilized so fast that our military advisers insist we cannot keep up our peacetime military commitments unless the draft is extended at least another year.

Public hearing on this question in Congress begins next week and that will be the topic on your Town Meeting next Thursday—"Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?"

We will hear from Assistant Secretary of War Howard C. Peterson; Radio Commentator Quincy Howe; and two veterans of this war who are well known to Town Meeting audiences, Regan "Tex" McCrary, now executive editor of the *American Mercury*, and Mil-lard Lampell, author of the new book, *The Long Way Home*.

For the summaries of tonight's discussion, here again is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Now we hear first from General Farrell.

General Farrell: There are two

points that I think are pertinent now. One is that Senator McMahon's proposal tonight for direct representation of the War and Navy Departments on the commission is a long way from the absolute denial of any contact with the problem as set forth in the first bill, Senate 1717. It is quite close to what the services have asked and I hope that Congress will pass legislation to give us that recognition.

Point No. 2 is that, while I give great credit to the scientific part of this development and no one gives it more credit than I, I want to say that they were not alone in this project. There was a great part played by the engineers, the industrialists, the workers, yes, and even the Army. It was a team, a great team, an American team that made the atomic bomb. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, General Farrell. Now a final word from Senator Brien McMahon.

Senator McMahon: I wish to correct one statement that General Farrell made which would indicate that I was springing something on this audience here tonight, by way of my suggestion that the Secretaries of Navy, State, and War might be added to the commission. In the original bill that I introduced on September 6, 1944, which incidentally was introduced in connection with the first word that was spoken on the floor of the Senate of the United

States in connection with this problem, the first speech that gave recognition to its implications, I suggested that very thing. Later it was decided to point up the May-Johnson Bill which was evidently designed to put a strangle hold of the military on the peacetime industrial uses and peacetime medical uses of atomic energy.

Now for the last ten days I have been endeavoring to get the committee to consider just that proposition so that we could do away with the Vandenberg amendment which in my opinion, as I have already told you, would do more to deprive—to deprive, mind you—the Army of the security and therefore, the American people of the security that we must have if we are not to get international control.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. We have about 25 seconds for Senator Johnson.

Senator Johnson: Well, I think that all of us are very happy that Senator McMahon is at last coming along and that he is now providing for consultation on the part of the War and Navy Departments. It is true, in his original bill that he introduced last September, that he advocated something along that line and then he got cold feet and introduced another bill that cut the military people clear out. Now he's kind of coming back again and we welcome

him back home. We welcome him home. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Johnson, Senator McMahon, Congressman Helen Gahagan Douglas, and Major General T. F. Farrell, I am glad to see that you all are really getting together on this subject. Maybe this discussion did some good after all.

Now I've just received the vote of our committee of judges which has awarded the \$25 United States Savings Bond for tonight's best question, "If the Army becomes the guardian of our atomic power, won't this postpone indefinitely the use of atomic developments for peacetime living?" The winner is Mr. Chester C. Diettert of North Judson, Indiana.

Now, remember if you have a question for next week it must be limited to 25 words and must reach us not later than April 3.

Before we close our meeting tonight, we have an urgent message from a great soldier, a great leader of men, General Omar Bradley, Director the Veterans' Administration who speaks to us from Washington.

General Bradley: When I am asked to talk about the Red Cross, I find it a little difficult to do. I find it so because it's like praising one of my old friends. I have to be careful not to say too much. For that's how I think of the Red Cross—as one of our long time friends, as one of the most indis-

MAY 2 1947

pensable friends of the soldier, of the veterans, and of their wives and children.

My opinion is based on what I saw of Red Cross service overseas. Here at home, as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I have also seen, firsthand, what the Red Cross means to the veteran and his family. In veterans' hospitals, it means the cheerful services that link an ill or discouraged man more closely with home.

Our Veterans' Administration doctors will tell you that by making the patient happier, by easing his mind of worries at home, the Red Cross helps to speed his recovery. To this testimony, our Veterans' Administration contact representatives in cities and towns, traveling the highways of America, would have a word to add about the Red Cross in the communities

where veterans have made their homes, for our contact representatives know that many a hardship case is brought to our attention by a local Red Cross Chapter, enabling a sick or jobless or puzzled veteran to obtain his rights and benefits; help him find his way to a healthy civilian life.

Those are some of the things I ask you to remember in these closing days of the 100 million dollar Red Cross Fund Campaign. It will bring courage and hope and happiness to the men who gave so much to keep America free. Let their unselfish gift of wartime service be the measure of your own gift to the Red Cross.

Announcer: Thank you, General Bradley. Remember, friends, to join us next week and every week, same time, at the sound of the Crier's bell.